TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

FEB 4 4 02 PN '03

In the Matter of:	
-------------------	--

RADIO MOULTRIE, INC., Licensee, Station WMGA (AM), Moultrie, Georgia EB Docket No. 02-367

DATE OF HEARING: — JANUARY 23,2003_____ VOLUME: ____1

PLACE OF HEARING: _WASHINGTON, D.C.___ PAGES: ____1-15

NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC. 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 TELEPHONE (202) 234-4433

Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

+ + + + +

PRE-HEARING CONFERENCE

+ + + + +

In the matter of:

RADIO MOULTRIE, INC. Licensee, Station WMGA (AM), Moultrie, Georgia. EB Docket No. 02-367

445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. Room TW-A363

Wednesday January 23, 2003

The above-entitled matter came on for conference, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m.

BEFORE:

Arthur Steinberg Administrative Law Judge

NEAL R. GROSS

APPEARANCES:

On Behalf of Douglas M. Sutton, Jr, Prospective Intervener:

JOHN F. GARZIGLIA, ESQ.
Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge, & Rice
Seventh Floor,
1402 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 857-4455

On Behalf of the FCC:

JAMES W. SHOOK, ESQ.
Federal Communications Commission
Enforcement Bureau
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, DC 20554
(202) 418-1420

KENNETH M. SCHEIBEL, JR., ESQ. Federal Communications Commission Mass Media Bureau 445 12th Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554 (202) 418-1792

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9;36 a.m.

ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: We're on the record now. This is a pre-hearing conference in EB docket number 02-367, which was designated for hearing by order to show cause and notice of opportunity for hearing, FCC 02-319, released November 26, 2002.

The issues in this proceeding seek to determine whether the licensee -- whether the license for Station WMGA (AM), Moultrie, Georgia, should be revoked for allegedly transferring control of the station without Commission authorization, for allegedly violating several specified Commission rules, and for the alleged failure of the licensee to respond to Commission letters of inquiry.

In addition, the Order to Show Cause authorized the imposition of a forfeiture for the alleged violations. By order, FCC 02M-108, released December 4th, 2002, the Chief Administrative Law Judge assigned this case to me and scheduled the initial prehearing conference for this morning.

Let me first take the appearances for the

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

9:36 a.m.

ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: We're on the record now. This is a pre-hearing conference in EB docket number 02-367, which was designated for hearing by order to show cause and notice of opportunity for hearing, FCC 02-319, released November 26, 2002.

The issues in this proceeding seek to determine whether the licensee -- whether the license for Station WMGA (AM), Moultrie, Georgia, should be revoked for allegedly transferring control of the station without Commission authorization, for allegedly violating several specified Commission rules, and for the alleged failure of the licensee to respond to Commission letters of inquiry.

In addition, the order to show cause authorized the imposition of a forfeiture for the alleged violations by order FCC 02M-108, released December 4th. 2002. The Chief Administrative Law Judge assigned this case to me and scheduled the initial pre-hearing conference for this morning.

Let me first take the appearances for the

1	parties. For Radio Moultrie, Incorporated, let the
2	record reflect no response. In addition, I looked at
3	the Commission's electronic filing comment system this
4	morning before I came down here and it does the
5	electronic filing system, does not reflect the filing
6	of any notice of appearance on behalf of Radio
7	Moultrie, Inc.
8	For the Chief, Enforcement Bureau, Federal
9	Communications Commission?
10	MR. SHOOK: James Shook and Kenneth
11	Scheibel.
12	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: And we had a
13	petition for leave to intervene filed on behalf of
14	Douglas M. Sutton, Jr. And let me take the appearance
15	for him at this time.
16	MR. GARZIGLIA: Yes, Your Honor. John F.
17	Garziglia of the law firm Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge
18	& Rice, Washington, D.C., for Douglas M. Sutton, Jr.
19	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Thank you. Let's
20	turn first to the failure to file notice of
21	appearance.
22	The Commission's records show I've been

The Commission's records show -- I'vebeen

able to look, and my legal tech looked, and we found that the Commission's records show that the order to show cause was mailed by the Commission to Radio Moultrie, Inc., by certified mail receipt, return receipt requested.

The order to show cause was also mailed by certified mail, return receipt requested, to Mr. G. Chris Elder, who was identified in paragraph 10 of the order to show cause, as "RMI's principal" and at footnote 21 of the order to show cause as "RMI's corporate principal."

The Commission got hack Mr. Elder's return receipt, which appears to hear his signature indicating that he received a copy of the order to show cause, which was mailed to him.

The United States Postal Service returned to the Commission intact and unopened the entire envelope which was sent to Radio Moultrie, Incorporated. The return receipt, which was appended to the back of that envelope, was marked "refused."

Also, let me turn the microphone over to Mr. Shook or Mr. Scheibel, because apparently the

1	Enforcement Bureau also mailed to Radio Moultrie, Inc.
2	a copy of the order to show cause, and you've got
3	other evidence of receipt and things like that?
4	MR. SHOOK: We do, Your Honor. Mr.
5	Scheibel will address this.
6	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Thank you.
7	MR SCHEIBEL: Yes, Your Honor. Radio
8	Moultrie, Inc. was sent a certified copy of the order
9	to show cause and it was received on December 2nd and
10	signed for by an individual whose handwriting is
11	unclear. But roughly
12	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: DO you know who
13	that looks like, a Mr that looks like a Sullivan.
14	Isn't somebody named Sullivan a principal?
15	MR SCHEIBEL: It may be. It's just that
16	it's hard for me to read.
17	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. There's
18	Paul
19	MR SCHEIBEL: It might be a Paul Sullivan.
20	but
21	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Paul Sullivan was
22	identified in paragraph 13 of the order to show cause

1	as, I guess, a
2	MR SCHEIBEL: Right.
3	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Somebody having
4	to do with that.
5	MR SCHEIBEL: That
6	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: So that could
7	Paul Sullivan?
8	MR SCHEIBEL: Right. It's the print
9	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yeah.
10	MR SCHEIBEL: version of his name isn't
11	much clearer than the
12	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, that's true.
13	MR SCHEIBEL: than the signature. In
14	any event, reference to the U.S. Postal Service's
15	track and confirm database yesterday afternoon
16	indicated that that very letter was delivered at 11:40
17	a.m. on December 2nd, 2002, to the addressee $^{ m i}^{ m n}$
18	Covington, Georgia.
19	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
20	MR SCHEIBEL: Also, at the same time that
21	Radio Moultrie was served, our office also sent a copy
22	of the order to show cause to Mr. G. Chris Elder and

that was signed for by a Susan Elder at the 1140 Milstead Street, Conyers, Georgia, address. And her signature on the date of delivery, although it was not indicated, the U.S. Postal Service track and confirm database indicates that it was delivered at 2:59 p.m. on November 30th, 2002.

ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Given this information, I don't think there's any question at all that Radio Moultrie, Incorporated received a copy of the Commission's order to show cause and notice of opportunity for hearing.

In that order to show cause, in paragraph 17, it directed that RMI, within 30 days of the receipt of the order, file a written notice of appearance. And I think, certainly, the 30 days has expired quite a long time ago.

Under section 1.92(a)(1) of the Commission's rules, as well as paragraph 17 of the order to show cause, both of those provide that under the circumstances that we just talked about, the failure to file the requisite notice of appearance constitutes a waiver of the right to a hearing.

i	And consequently, pursuant to section
2	1.92(c) of the rules, and paragraph 18 of the order to
3	show cause, the presiding judge will issue an order
4	reciting the events or circumstances constituting a
5	waiver of the hearing, and terminating the proceeding,
6	and certifying the case to the Commission
7	Does anybody have any comments on that?
8	Mr. Garziglia?
9	MR. GARZIGLIA: Your Honor, I would like
10	to comment for the limited purpose of the filing I
11	made on ~-
12	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes.
13	MR. GARZIGLIA: December 23rd.
14	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes, I was going
15	to get to that next.
15	MR. GARZIGLIA: And I'll ask for your
17	leave to comment at the appropriate time.
18	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Yes. But you
19	don't have any comment about me issuing an order
20	terminating the proceeding and certifying it in
21	accordance with the rules and the order to show cause?
22	MR. GARZIGLIA: That appears to be the

appropriate thing, Your Honor. 1 ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Thank you. 2 Mr. Shook and Mr. Scheibel? 3 4 MR. SHOOK: We're every happy with that result, Your Honor. 5 6 ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. 7 next thing is the petition for leave to intervene, 8 which was filed by Mr. Sutton on December 23rd, 2002. And the Enforcement Bureau's comments in support of 9 the petition to intervene filed on January 3rd, 2003. 10 Mr. Sutton seeks leave to intervene in 11 this proceeding for the limited purpose of correcting 12 the record to show that he holds no present ownership 13 interest in Radio Moultrie, Incorporated, a licensee 14 of Station WMGA (AM), and that he has not held any 15 16 such interest since 1992. 17 In support, Mr. Sutton submits a copy of Commission grant of a transfer of control 18 19 application, whereby Mr. Sutton's interest in Radio 20 Moultrie was sold to the other two principals of Radio Moultrie, and an ownership report filed with the 21

Commission reflecting the consummation of the sale.

The Commission grant was dated September 29th,1992, and the ownership report was dated December 1st. 1992.

Mr. Sutton therefore requests leave to intervene for the sole purpose of making the Commission grant and the ownership report a part of the record of this proceeding, and for the purpose of requesting that any order or decision released as a result of this proceeding reflect that since September 1992, Mr. Sutton has had no ownership interest in Radio Moultrie. The Bureau supports a grant of Mr. Sutton's motion.

The question I had is given the fact that this proceeding will be terminated, is there still a reason for intervention?

MR. GARZIGLIA: Your Honor, Mr. Sutton would be pleased if any subsequent order you would release that would go forward as a part of the record of this proceeding would simply correct the erroneous impression which was given in footnote number 6 of the November 26, 2002 order to show cause, if you would simply note in some fashion that this material is part

of the official record of the Commission, that Mr. Sutton did file this -- these materials with you, that Bureau counsel supported the facts, the factual supported, the factual record recited, that -- and it's your conclusion that Mr. Sutton has had no -- has no ownership interest in Radio Moultrie, contrary to the impression that could have been left by footnote number 6, that would be what Mr. Sutton requests.

ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. My problem is if there's no proceeding, if the proceeding is terminated even before it really starts, why even issue the order? I mean, your petition to intervene - why can't I just dismiss both pleadings as moot, since there's no proceeding in which to intervene? And the petition to intervene, and the Bureau's comments in support will just speak for themselves.

MR. GARZIGLIA: Mr. Sutton still is a little bit concerned that the official pronouncements of the Commission, which is in the November 26, 2002 order to show cause, leave the erroneous impression.

And while we appreciate that we have on the record our petition to intervene, and the Bureau's

S

2.2

1	comments in support, there is no official recognition
2	from the Commission that, indeed, that footnote was in
3	error. And we would be appreciative of any official
4	recognition of Your Honor which represents the
5	Commission in this regard.
6	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: So you're asking
7	me to make findings of fact in essence on the basis of
8	a petition to intervene? I'm giving you a hard time.
9	You know that. And because I can.
10	MR. GARZIGLIA: A footnote, Your Honor, in
11	response to the commission's footnote, would be
12	entirely sufficient.
13	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Mr. Shook,
14	Mr. Scheibel?
15	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, first of all, our
16	pleading speaks for itself. But more to the point of
17	your question, we believe that your order certifying
18	the matter to the Commission could also include within
19	it an order that grants the petition. This is simply
20	a mechanism for getting this information into the
21	record at this stage.

WASHINGTON DC 20005-3701

And frankly, even if such were not done on

1	your part, we have every intention of including that
2	information in the final order that would be released
3	by the Commission, so as to make it crystal clear that
4	Mr. Sutton had left the scene long before there were
5	any difficulties that we will
6	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
7	MR. SHOOK: say that Radio Moultrie
8	had.
9	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: I'll take that
10	matter under advisement. I don't want to commit
11	myself this morning to such a momentous decision.
12	MR. GARZIGLIA: I appreciate that, Your
13	Honor. Mr. Sutton is an esteemed broadcaster. He's-
14	
15	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay.
16	MR. GARZIGLIA: very concerned with how
17	the world and the FCC views his record. And that's
18	the purpose of my
19	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. I might
20	just grant leave, grant your petition for leave to
21	intervene, and then you're a party to the proceeding
22	and you an say whatever you want to say in subsequent

WASHINGTON, D.C 20005-3701

1	things. But anyway, I'm just being I'm just being
2	a troublemaker.
3	Is there anything else we have to talk about
4	today? I mean, relating to this case? We can sit
5	here and chat for the rest of the day, if you want,
6	but
7	MR. SHOOK: Your Honor, once again, it's
8	been a pleasure doing business with you. But I
9	believe we've completed all that we need to here.
10	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Mr.
11	Garziglia?
12	MR. GARZIGLIA: I have nothing further,
13	Your Honor. Thank you very much.
14	ADMIN. JUDGE STEINBERG: Okay. Then we'll
15	go off the record at this time and thank you all for
16	coming.
17	(Whereupon, the hearing in the above-
18	entitled matter was adjourned at 9:50 a.m.)
19	
2 0	
21	
22	

(ATTACHMENT 4
Transcript
Certification)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER, TRANSCRIBER, AND PROOFREADER

RADIO MOUL	TRIE, INC.
Name of Hearing	
02- 3b3	
Docket No. (if applic	able)
MASHINGTON,	D.C.
Place of Hearing	
JAN. 23, 200	.3
Date of Hearing	<u></u>
bace of ficulting	
We, the undersigned,	do hereby certify that the foregoing pages,
numbersthrough	15, inclusive, are the true, transcript prepared from the reporting by
accurate and complete	transcript prepared from the reporting by
HENDRIVSON (Ren	orter's Name) in attendance at the above
identified hearing, i	n accordance with applicable provisions of
the current Federal C	ommunications Commission's professional
	d transcription statement of Work and have
	of the transcript by (1) comparing the
	t against the reporting or recording
	earings and (2) comparing the final proofed
accomplished at the h	t against the reporting or recording
accomparaned at the h	
FEB. 3, 2003	(EVIN MURPHY () LAND
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber
	Name of Company: NEAL GROSS Co.
 Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber
vate	Name of Company:
	Nume of Company.
Date	Legible Name and Signature of Transcriber
	Name of Company:
	name of company.

(NOTE: THIS CERTITICATE MAY BE PHOTOCOPIED AND NEED NOT BE TYPEWRITTEN)